

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International STD Research &amp; Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_I-SRR_95996</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Daily oral Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis uptake, adherence and retention among Female Sex Workers in the Greater Gaborone City, Botswana</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journali-srr.com/index.php/I-SRR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The contents in the manuscript are crucial if presented well can contribute to the body of knowledge towards sexual and reproductive health 2. If the title of the manuscript could read 'Uptake, adherence and retention of daily oral Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis among Female Sex Workers in the Greater Gaborone City, Botswana'. 3. The article could be improved if the author includes the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Background of the study and problematisation of the issue and the justification in a snapshot</li> <li>▪ well-structured methodology</li> <li>▪ Results showing the major issues raised from the study</li> <li>▪ Recommendations.</li> </ul> 4. If revisited can be appropriate, the researcher should have subsections that relates to the study's objectives. 5. The data collection methods were poorly presented, the author should articulate how each method was used to collect data, the sampling technique and the how the author captured the information. 6. The area is well researched there is need to have references not later than 2018. 7. The discussion section should relate to the literature review, and proffering recommendations for the issues raised.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	1. The author can make use of professional proof readers for the disciple understudy.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Andrea Toweka</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Zimbabwe, Zimbabwe</b>